4.16 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Section 4.16

Population and Housing

4.16.1 Introduction

This section summarizes existing and forecasted population and housing in the project vicinity, including University-specific enrollment and housing characteristics, and evaluates the potential for the project to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly.

Information in this section is based on the 2000 census, University Institutional Research and Planning reports, and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) reports. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials appear in Section 4.16.6 (References) of this section.

Three verbal comments related to population and housing were received in response to the NOP circulated for the proposed project. The NOP, comments on the NOP, and a summary of issues raised during scoping are included in Appendices A and B of this EIR.

Verbal comments on the NOP and at the Public Scoping meeting included suggestions that the EIR address: (1) population growth and subsequent strains on the environment resulting from new housing developments; (2) growth in visitors to the area resulting from new parking areas; (3) concern over housing placed on West Campus Bluffs; and (4) preferences for the housing options on the North Parcel over the South Parcel.

4.16.2 Existing Setting

4.16.2.1 Overview

According to the 2000 census, the population of the County of Santa Barbara is about 400,000 (SBCAG, 2000). The unincorporated proportion of the County population has dropped by 27,500 due to the newly incorporated City of Goleta. The City of Santa Barbara population was estimated at 89,600. The Santa Barbara Subdivision of the County includes the most heavily populated coastal portion of the County. It includes the City of Santa Barbara, Goleta, and coastal portions of the County west to Gaviota State Park. There were 181,894 persons in the Santa Barbara Subdivision as measured by the 2000 Census.

The age distribution of the County's population is influenced by educational facilities such as the University and City College that increases the proportion of 18 to 24-year-old college students, as shown in comparison to California numbers in Table 4.16-1.

In 2000, the County had a total of 142,901 housing units. Of the total housing units, 65 were single-unit structures (7 percent of these are condos), 29 percent were in multi-unit structures, and 6 percent were mobile homes. Nine percent of the units were built after 1990. The overall vacancy rate for the County was 4.4 percent or 6,279 units. The homeowner vacancy rate was 0.8 percent and renter vacancy rate was 2.8 percent. Table 4.16-2 shows the percentage of households that show overcrowding with over one occupant per room, the percent of those

Section 4.16

Population and Housing

who have moved into their unit within a year previous to the 2000 census, and those units that do not have vehicles and telephones.

Table 4.16-1. Population By Age

Area	Total Population	Under 18 Years	18-24 Years	25-44 Years	45-64 Years	65+ Years
California	33,871,648	27.3%	9.9%	31.6%	20.5%	10.6%
Santa Barbara County	399,347	24.9%	13.3%	29.0%	20.1%	12.7%

Source: 2000 Census.

Table 4.16-2. Household Characteristics

Area	Housing Units	I.01+ Occupants Per Room	Moved Into Unit 1999 to March 2000	No Vehicles Available	No Telephone Available	3+ Bedrooms
California	12,214,549	15.2%	21.4%	9.5%	1.5%	47.4%
Santa Barbara County	142,901	12.9%	21.3%	6.9%	1.1%	49.7%

Source: 2000 Census.

Thirty-two percent of owners and 47 percent of renters in the County spent 30 percent or more of their household income on housing. The median housing value and owner/renter costs for the County are greater than the state averages, as shown in Table 4.16-3. In addition, the median home sale price in the City of Santa Barbara in 2002 was \$717,000 (City of Santa Barbara, 2003).

Table 4.16-3. Median Housing Costs

Area	Median Value	Median Owner Costs	Median Gross Rent
California	\$211,500	\$1,478	\$747
Santa Barbara County	\$293,000	\$1,514	\$830
Santa Barbara City	\$480,000	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$980

Source: 2000 Census.

SBCAG generated a regional growth forecast in 1994 for the years 1990 to 2015 (SBCAG, 1994). The purpose of the regional growth forecast was to provide a set of consistent, countywide forecasts to the year 2015 for use in long-range comprehensive planning. Key forecasts from this report include the following:

• The population of the County is forecast to increase from 370,000 in 1990 to 479,000 by the year 2015.

The County's population will increase by 110,000 persons between 1990 and 2015. Section 4.16 Approximately 62 percent of this growth will occur in the North County market areas. The proportion of the County's population living on the South Coast will drop from 52 percent of the total in 1990 to 49 percent in 2015.

Pobulation and Housing

- Household sizes will generally continue to increase in many areas. Some areas will likely experience only a minor increase in household size due to a variety of economic and demographic factors. A growing proportion of the population may reside in multi-family units, due to the high cost of housing.
- Even with sufficient land for urban use, pressures will always exist for the conversion of certain agricultural parcels to more intensive uses. However, local agency general plans have policies to preserve agriculture as both an important contribution to the economy and to provide regional open space and conservation areas. Because of these policies, this growth forecast presumes no conversion of lands with a general plan designation of agriculture. However, land currently in agriculture, but designated residential, is included in the build-out estimate. No annexations are assumed for the forecast period, with the exception of Santa Maria City, which has an annexation proposal nearing final approval.

The Santa Barbara South Coast Community Indicators report (prepared annually as a joint project of the UCSB Economic Forecast Project, the Santa Barbara Regional Economic Community Project, and the Partnership for Excellence Conference) provides information on social, environmental, and economic factors in the South Coast area of Santa Barbara County. The report includes a housing affordability index as a measure of the percentage of households that can afford to own a median priced home or condominium. The index is based on median family income, median selling prices, mortgage rates, property taxes, and homeowners insurance. The 2003 report estimated that only 5.3 percent of South Coast residents could afford to purchase the median-value single family home, and only 22.3 percent could afford to purchase the median-value condominium (SCCIP, 2003).

4.16.2.2 University Population and Housing Characteristics

According to the 2002–2003 Campus Profile compiled by the Institutional Research & Planning Department, enrollment totals are presented below in Table 4.16-4 (UCSB, 2003a). Table 4.16-5 provides a summary of University personnel by category. A summary of where University students reside is provided in Table 4.16-6, below.

In 2002, the University conducted a faculty, staff, and student housing and transportation survey as part of the University's on-going effort to develop long-range plans for the campus (UCSB, 2002). The survey was designed to identify housing, parking, and travel patterns among the University campus community. Further, the survey explored housing as a quality of life issue and its impact on local transportation and the community. Key findings from this survey are outlined below.

Section 4.16

Population and Housing

Table 4.16-4. University Enrollment

Class Level	Total Headcount
Freshmen	4,458
Sophomore	3,419
Junior	4,992
Senior	4,828
Other	17
Total Undergraduates	17,714
Total Graduates	2,845
Total Campus	20,559

Note: The fall quarter is always higher than the 3-quarter average, and the University's 20,000-enrollment cap refers to a 3-quarter average.

Table 4.16-5. University Personnel

Category	Number
Academic Staff	Total
Faculty	1036
Other ^l	2495
Total academic staff	3,531
Non Academic Staff	
Professionals and Support Services	5516
Other	481
Total non-academic	5,997
Campus total	9,528

 $\label{thm:continuity} \mbox{'Other included administrators, researchers, student assistants, etc.}$

Source: UCSB 2002-2003 Campus Profile

Table 4.16-6. Location of Student Residences

Section 4.16
Population and Housing

Location	Number	%
University		
Residence Halls	3,138	15%
Francisco Torres Residence Hall	1,010	5%
Family Student Housing	545	3%
Santa Ynez Apartments	661	3%
Eldorado Apartments	137	1%
Westgate Apartments	59	0%
West Campus Point	4	0%
University Subtotal	5,554	27%
Goleta		
Ellwood	702	3%
Other Goleta	1,579	8%
Goleta Subtotal	2,281	11%
Isla Vista		
Off-Campus Residence Halls/Co-op	684	3%
Fraternities/Sororities	590	3%
Other IV	7,473	36%
Isla Vista Subtotal	8,747	43%
Montecito/SB		
Montecito	57	0%
Santa Barbara	1,806	9 %
Montecito/SB Subtotal	1,863	9 %
Other Locations		
Other SB County/SLO	207	1%
Ventura County	431	2%
Los Angeles	250	1%
Education Abroad Program	360	2%
Other Locations Subtotal	1,248	6%
Addresses Unknown	866	4%
Total Students	20,559	100%

Source: UCSB 2002-2003 Campus Profile

Section 4.16 4.16.2.2.1 Faculty/Staff

Population and Housing

- Most faculty and staff members surveyed reside in the Santa Barbara/Goleta area (79 percent). Fifteen percent live outside of the Santa Barbara area (including Santa Ynez, Buellton, Solvang, Lompoc, and Santa Maria to the north, and Carpinteria, Ventura, and Oxnard to the south).
- Eight out of 10 (81 percent) University faculty members own their current residence, and 48 percent of University staff are homeowners. Homeowners tend to live outside of the Santa Barbara area. Only 52 percent of faculty and staff members who live in the Santa Barbara area own their homes, compared to 73 percent who live north of Santa Barbara and 69 percent who live to the south. Faculty (73 percent) are more likely than staff (57 percent) to live in a single-family house. Faculty housing is home to 3 percent of University faculty. Two percent of all faculty and staff live in University housing.
- While 63 percent of University faculty and staff surveyed are either "very" or "somewhat satisfied" with their current housing situation, one-fourth (26 percent) are dissatisfied. Faculty members are more satisfied with their current housing situation than staff 43 percent are "very satisfied," compared to 34 percent of staff. Length of time living in current home is directly related to overall satisfaction with housing. Half (50 percent) of faculty and staff who have been in their current homes for at least 10 years are "very satisfied" with housing. This is double the number of faculty and staff who moved into their homes within the previous year (25 percent "very satisfied"). Furthermore, only 32 percent of those who have lived in the same home for two to nine years are "very satisfied." These numbers correlate with the steady decline in the housing affordability index since 1992, reported by the 2001 SCCIB.
- Cost of housing appears to be the aspect with which University faculty and staff are least satisfied. Sixty-four percent (64 percent) of all faculty and staff report dissatisfaction with the cost of housing, with nearly half (47 percent) being "very dissatisfied." Faculty and staff are also dissatisfied, to a lesser extent, with housing availability—47 percent are "somewhat" or "very dissatisfied" with this aspect.

4.16.2.2.2 Students

• The majority (92 percent) of both undergraduate and graduate students rent or lease their current homes. Six percent of undergraduate students live with parents or relatives. Half (51 percent) of the undergraduates surveyed live in apartments (including condos, studios, duplexes, etc.). Other common housing choices among undergrads are on-campus residence halls (18 percent), off-campus residence halls (12 percent), single-family houses (11 percent), and University-owned apartments (5 percent). Graduate students also typically live in apartments (47 percent). Graduates are more likely than undergrads to live in a single-family house (24 percent). Nineteen percent of graduate students live in University family housing, and 8 percent live in University-owned apartments.

Three-fourths (76 percent) of undergraduate students live either on campus (18 percent) or Section 4.16 in Isla Vista (58 percent), while the majority of graduate students live a little further away in Goleta (37 percent) or Santa Barbara (32 percent). Only 5 percent of all students live outside of the Santa Barbara area.

Population and Housing

The majority (57 percent) of University students are either "very" (22 percent) or "somewhat satisfied" (35 percent) with their current housing situation. However, one-fourth (26 percent) are dissatisfied. Graduate students rate their satisfaction with housing higher than undergraduates (65 percent versus 56 percent satisfied). Residents of University-owned apartments and University family housing are the most satisfied—nearly half (45 percent) are "very satisfied." Students living in apartments are the least satisfied—31 percent are dissatisfied with housing.

4.16.2.3 North Campus and West Campus Mesa

There are 250 units of existing family student housing at the West Campus Apartments southeast of the Ocean Meadows Golf Course at the intersection of Storke and El Colegio roads. There are also 65 units of existing faculty housing at the West Campus Point complex on West Campus Mesa.

4.16.2.4 West Campus Bluffs, Coal Oil Point, and COPR

A caretaker's residence is present at Coal Oil Point. There is currently no residential housing at the West Campus Bluffs or within the COPR.

4.16.3 Regulatory Framework

There are no federal, state, or local population and housing regulations specifically applicable to the proposed project.

4.16.4 Project Impacts and Mitigations

4.16.4.1 <u>Methodology</u>

For those areas in which new residential development or improvements to vacant land may occur, the number of persons that would reside in the new development was calculated. Existing population and housing data was reviewed, based on information included in the environmental setting, to determine whether an increase in population would constitute a substantial population increase. In addition, existing housing trends were assessed in order to determine the effect of additional residential units on the area housing supply.

4.16.4.2 **LRDP Policies**

The Coastal Act Element of the LRDP included a range of policies and standards (herein termed LRDP policies) to demonstrate consistency of the LRDP, and projects implemented under the

Section 4.16

Population and Housing

LRDP, with the statutory requirements of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act (commencing with Section 30200). No LRDP policies related to population and housing has been identified.

4.16.4.3 Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact related to geology and geologic hazards if it would result in any of the following:

- Induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- Displace substantial numbers of housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere
- Displace substantial numbers of existing people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

4.16.4.4 Effects Not Found to be Significant

Threshold. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing, therefore the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of this EIR) determined that no effects associated with displacement of existing housing (necessitating the construction of replacement housing) would occur and no additional analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any people, therefore the Initial Study (included in Appendix A of this EIR) determined that no effects associated with displacement of people (necessitating the construction of replacement housing) would occur, and no additional analysis is required in this EIR.

4.16.4.5 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 4.16-1. Implementation of the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth in the area by providing additional housing for faculty and student families, nor or indirectly induce population growth by improving coastal access or improving management of undeveloped areas. This impact would be *less than significant*.

Amendment of the LRDP to permit residential development on the North Campus, coastal access improvements, and open space management activities, including habitat restoration,

would increase in the residential population of the project area and increase visitation of Open Section 4.16 Space Plan areas; however, such actions would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth.

Population and Housing

The provision of faculty housing implements the 1990 LRDP MM 4.7-2, which requires the campus to "...continue to offer a variety of housing assistance measures that increase the affordability of home ownership for faculty."

Development of 236 units of faculty housing and 151 units of family student housing would increase the residential population of the project area by approximately 1,003 new persons, including 612 persons residing in the faculty housing and 391 residing in the family student housing, as shown in Table 4.16-7. As the proposed residential development would provide housing for faculty and students that would be enrolled or employed at the University even without the proposed project, neither employment nor enrollment at University would increase as a result of the proposed project.

As of the 2000 Census, 181,894 persons resided within the Santa Barbara Subdivision of the County, an area that includes the City of Santa Barbara, Goleta, and coastal portions of the County west to Gaviota State Park. The residents of the proposed project would represent approximately 0.5 percent of the area population.

Table 4.16-7. Project-Related Residential Population

Project	Number of Units	Persons Per Unit	Project-Related Population
Faculty Housing	236	2.59	612
Sierra Madre Student Housing	151	2.59	391
Open Space Plan	0	0	0
Total	387	_	1,003

Based on an average household size of 2.75 persons in Santa Barbara County (California Department of Finance, 2003), it is assumed that the average household size for both faculty and student families would be equivalent to the countywide average.

Source. EIP Associates.

The provision of additional housing units would increase the area housing supply, which could indirectly induce population growth, as existing units could be vacated by faculty and student families that would relocate to the new on-campus housing. As of 2000, a total of 37,076 units of housing were located within the City of Santa Barbara, and another 58,672 units of housing were located within unincorporated areas of the County (California Department of Finance, 2003), which included Goleta at that time. As discussed in Section 3.4The Santa Barbara area is acknowledged to be facing a substantial housing shortage; particularly with respect to housing that is affordable to existing University students and faculty, which the project is intended to address. With a vacancy rate of 2.8 percent in the rental market, the project would alleviate existing pressure on rental units in the area. However, an increase in housing of 387 units would

Section 4.16
Population
and Housing

not represent a substantial increase in housing supply, and therefore would not induce substantial population growth in the area.

Implementation of the portion of the Open Space Plan under the University's jurisdiction would result in coastal access improvements, including: (1) improvement of existing trails, (2) improvement of existing beach access points, (3) installation of a new coastal access stairway, (4) provision of additional public parking, and (5) replacement of an existing portable restroom. No reliable estimate of a potential increase in recreational visitors to the undeveloped areas is feasible, however it is anticipated that such increases would be limited by the availability of public parking (which could total 84 spaces). Given the relatively small number of parking spaces, it is unlikely that recreational visitors to the project area will represent a substantial number, when considered in relation to existing recreation use and the area population.

The increase in residential occupants of the area and recreational visitors to the Open Space Plan areas could increase demand for retail goods and services from commercial establishments in the vicinity of the project area. Increased demand for retail goods and services could indirectly induce population growth in the area; however, given the relatively minor increase in onsite residential population (in relation to area population), the proposed project would not indirectly induce substantial population. The extension of roads and infrastructure associated with project development would only serve the project area and would not indirectly induce growth of any areas adjacent to the project.

Development of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area, and this impact would be *less than significant*.

4.16.5 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative population and housing impacts is the region represented by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments. The cumulative context within this geographic area includes all growth envisioned by SBCAG in the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Growth Forecast, which includes all growth anticipated to occur through 2030.

As indicated in Section 4.16.2.1, the population in the County is forecast to increase from 370,000 in 1990 to 479,000 by the year 2015 to 521,000 by 2030, which represents an approximate increase of 30 percent Countywide. However, since 1940, the 1950-1960 period was the decade of the greatest population increase, representing an increase of 77 percent. The increase for 1990-2000 was substantially less, at 8 percent, and the growth rate is forecast to fall further still, approximately just 3 percent between 2020 and 2030. Limited vacant land limits the potential for nonresidential development in the City of Santa Barbara. The Goleta area will also experience some growth limits due to the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance. The primary areas expected to experience population growth include the Santa Maria Valley, Lompoc Valley, and unincorporated areas of the South Coast. Cumulative development is anticipated to both accommodate and induce this growth, depending upon the type of development proposed.

However, the population growth has been forecasted in local and regional planning documents, and appropriate plans, policies, and regulations are in place to accommodate this growth. As discussed in Section 3.4, the Santa Barbara area is acknowledged to be facing a substantial housing shortage; particularly with respect to housing that is affordable to existing University students and faculty, which the project is intended to address. Therefore, the cumulative impact is less than significant.

Section 4.16
Population
and Housing

The proposed project would contribute to the cumulative population increase by adding 1,003 persons to the local population. Other projects in the area include the Ocean Meadows Residence development, concurrently proposed on the Ocean Meadows Golf Course property under the jurisdiction of the County, which would result in development of 56 units and 168 persons. In total, the proposed project and the Ocean Meadows Residences would add 1,237 persons to the North Campus area. However, portions of the project site were identified for residential development when acquired by the University, and the North Parcel was acknowledged for residential development in the Goleta Community Plan. Thus, the residential use and associated population increases have been projected on site and considered in regional growth plans. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed project to impacts associated with an inducement of substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly, would not be considered cumulatively considerable and a less than significant impact would result.

4.16.6 References

The following is a list of references for this subsection. Please refer to Section 9.0 for the master reference list.

- California State Department of Finance. 2003. E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2003, Revised 2002 and Revised 2001, with 2000 DRU Benchmark. May. http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5text2.htm Accessed December 6, 2003.
- City of Santa Barbara. 2000. Community Development Department. Census 2000 Summary Table. http://ci.santa-barbara.ca.us/departments/community_development/quicklinks/census.html. Accessed October 20, 2003.
 - 2003. City of Santa Barbara Facts. Accessed October 30, 2003. http://ci.santa-barbara.ca.us/local_information/City_Fact_Sheet.pdf.
- Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). 1994. Regional Growth Forecast 1994.
 - 2000. Census 2000 Overview for Santa Barbara County.
- Santa Barbara South Coast Community Indicators Project. 2002. Community Indicators 2002. http://www.ucsb-efp.com/indicators/index.htm November. Accessed October 30, 2003

Section 4.16

Population and Housing

University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). 2002. Institutional Research & Planning Department. 2002 Faculty, Staff, and Student Housing & Transportation Survey.

2003a. Department of Institutional Research & Planning Department. 2002-2003 Campus Profile. February.

2003. Office of Budget and Planning. University Projected Faculty Renewal and Growth Model. September.